DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 421 EC 052 699

AUTHOR Pascale, Pietro J.; Murray, Joseph
TITLE A Survey of Professional Needs in Special Education for Northeastern Ohio.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Needs; *Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Inservice Teacher Education; Learning Disabilities; *Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Seventy-five teachers working in the area of special education and learning disabilities were administered a 112 item questionnaire concerning instructional and program needs, Participants were from Northeastern Ohio representing the cities of Youngstown, Akron, Kent, and several suburban districts. Also evaluated was a summer workshop attended by the participants. The greatest need expressed was in the area of managing unacceptable behavior. Teachers from all three cities approved of inservice modes such as lecture with demonstration, demonstration by expert, and work session with children. Teachers reported a preference for moderate personal active involvement in inservice teacher training programs. The questionnaire covered topics such as demographic data, expressed needs in general and instructional categories, expressed needs in content areas, endorsement of specific methods of presenting inservice training, and evaluation of content and presentation of workshop material (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 082421

A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL NEEDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR NORTHEASTERN OHIO

DR. PIETRO J. PASCALE
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

DR. JOSEPH MURRAY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

EC 052699

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ABSTRACT

Seventy-five teachers working in the area of Special Education and Learning Disabilities were administered a lengthy questionnaire concerning instructional and program needs. The participants were from Northeastern Ohio representing the cities of Youngstown, Akron, and Kent including several suburban districts.

The questionnaire results are analyzed in a straightforward manner using percentages and tabular presentation of data. The questionnaire comprised over one hundred items consisting of demographic data, preferences for specific instructional skills, and evaluative remarks concerning a completed workshop.

In summary, the report serves as a needs assessment for further workshops in the area of Special Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEACHER - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FOCUS PARTICIPANTS
- General Categories
- Instructional Categories
- Content Areas

METHOD OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE

EVALUATION OF SUMMER WORKSHOP
- Content and Presentation
- Environment and Facilities
- Scheduling and Organization

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE COMMENTS
- Most Valuable Aspect
- Least Valuable Aspect

TABLES

TEACHER - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

For this first section only, general trends will be presented. The complete tallies for the teacher-demographic data by percentages are listed conveniently in Table 1. Percentages rather than frequency counts are tabulated because of the uneven sample sizes of the three major groups represented (Youngstown, N = 14; Akron, N = 22; Kent, N = 39). In reading the tables please note that T represents the total groups (N = 75); Y, A, and K are respectively Youngstown, Akron, and Kent.

The plurality category of numbers of years of teaching experience was one year or less. Very few of the participants are not interested in some type of future administrative or supervisory position. About ninety percent of the participants were female; several people failed to indicate their sex which explains why the percentages in the tables don't sum up to one hundred percent. In several other places percentages do not sum up to 100% which is explained by rounding errors.

Most participants are married (71%); a few are divorced (19%); the remaining are single (19%). The Akron group deviates a bit from this pattern. Eighty-two percent of the Akron group are married, and only five percent are single.

Most participants fall in the category of 20-30 years of age. Around thirty percent fall in the category of 30-40 years.

Very few are 50 years or older. There is quite a bit of variability in the total years of teaching experience. There is also variability with previous experience with in-service education. About 27% have not attended any workshops and 36% have attended one to five workshops. Almost 15% have attended fifteen or more workshops.

Approximately sixty percent have been teaching one year or less in their current assigned area of Special Education. No one has been teaching ten or more years in their current assigned area. Very few have been teaching four to ten years in their current position.

The majority (80%) of participants have a bachelors degree. Almost twenty percent have a masters degree. Only two participants indicated they had no degree. Very many are enrolled in non-degree programs. About eleven percent are enrolled in an Educational Specialist program. Fifty-four percent of the Kent group are enrolled in Masters programs, and about thirty percent of the Youngstown group are enrolled in Masters programs. Quite a large contingent (75%) from the Akron group are involved in non-degree programs.

The prevailing economic status of participants' systems is predominantly middle class. However, there is a sizeable representation from disadvantaged areas. Eight percent of the participants indicated they were currently working in the inner city; about twenty-five percent indicated they were working in "other urban" areas; about forty percent were working in suburban settings; around twenty-five percent were currently in-

volved in rural settings. Very few participants were from the pre-school level. The majority of participants were from the early elementary level. About twenty-five percent represented the Intermediate level. Several people (7%) were from the Junior High level.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FOCUS PARTICIPANTS

General Categories

By far the greatest need across the three groups was in the area of managing unacceptable behavior. For the Youngstown group a grave need emerged in the area of resolving severe student social, emotional, and health problems. For the Akron and Kent groups a strong need for developing student interest in classroom activities was indicated.

The least serious need for the Youngstown group was in the area of developing student interest in classroom activities and student interest in activities outside the classroom. The least serious need for the Akron group was in the area of building productive school, home, and community relationships. The least serious need for the Kent group was in the area of developing student activities outside the classroom. For the total group (N = 75) the area of developing student interest in activities outside the classroom was a low priority need. The figures in Table 2 are relatively high. One caveat is in order here--the phrase "least serious need" should be interpreted in the sense that one usually must attach priority to needs. In a ranking procedure one may derive a "low order" need, and this label should not be equated with "very little" need. It could very well be that <u>all</u> the needs are grave.

Instructional Categories

The Youngstown group perceived their greatest needs in the areas of planning instruction, diagnostic assessment techniques, and instructional techniques. The Youngstown group had relatively higher percents in all six instructional categories. Evidently they perceived serious needs in all six categories.

The Akron group perceived their greatest need in the area of diagnostic and assessment techniques. The Kent group perceived their greatest need in the area of instructional techniques.

Content Areas

In the instructional categories the following three content areas consistently received middle or low percentages (Table 3): science, health, and safety; social studies; occupational orientation. The following content areas received moderately high percentages: language arts; arithmetic; motor and perceptual training; speech and language training.

Across the six instructional categories the Youngstown group indicated high percentages while the Kent group usually indicated lower percentages than either the Youngstown or Akron groups. The important point in the conclusions reached in the paragraph above is that a hierarchy of needs was postulated on the basis of a rank ordering of the content areas within each instructional category.

In the category of evaluation of student progress (grading procedures) there was expressed interest in having more information concerning evaluation in academic areas, classroom behavior,

and motor and perceptual development. There was little expressed need in the area of evaluation of occupational orientation and only moderate expressed interest in evaluation of non-academic subjects. The Kent group indicated the least need for evaluation in the area of motor and perceptual development. The Youngstown group unanimously (100%) expressed a need for information on evaluation in the area of motor and perceptual development.

METHOD OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE*

Modes of In-Service Preferred

The mode of presentation receiving the lowest level of endorsement for all three groups was the lecture method. The lecture with demonstration received the highest level of endorsement from the Youngstown group (100%). There was a three-way tie for the highest level of endorsement from the Akron group--rap session with expert (91%), demonstration by expert (91%), and work session with children (91%). The Kent group preferred most (85%) a work session in which a skill is introduced and participants are given a chance to practice the skill.

The following modes received a relatively low level of endorsement across all groups--the lecture, the lecture with reaction panel, professional seminar or round table, and regional conference. The following modes received a relatively high level of endorsement across all groups--lecture with demonstration, demonstration by expert, work session with children, work session where a skill is introduced and participants are given a chance to practice, and consultant working with teacher in classroom.

Parts of Year Most Convenient

The Youngstown group indicated the most convenient time of the year for in-service to be before school starts in Fall. Both

*Percents represent the total category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

the Akron and Kent group indicated the best time to be during summer vacation. The least convenient time for all groups was by far before Christmas. Apparently, respondents perceived this item to mean just before Christmas. Another inconvenient time was near the end of Spring semester.

Day of Week Most Convenient

Sunday was regarded by all groups to be the least convenient day of the week. Saturday was regarded as the most convenient time by all groups.

Time of Day Most Convenient

There was general consensus across the three groups on all of the items in this category. By far the two most endorsed responses for all groups were Saturday (9:00 a.m. to noon) and weekdays 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. a close second choice.

Size, Site, and Involvement

Participants indicated no clear preference for any one particular size of in-service group. Both extremes (five or less and over twenty-five) were avoided. It is a safe conclusion to estimate the preferred size of group to be between six and twenty-five. The Akron group, however, appeared to favor eleven to fifteen size.

There was unilateral agreement across the groups in preference for place of in-service. School building was by far the least preferred site. Instructional Materials Center was

by far the most preferred site. Second choice for all groups was University facility.

There was a consistent finding across the groups on the question of reimbursement. The tally on the total pretty much reflects the individual group tallies. Forty percent (40%) indicated that reimbursement would have no effect on attendance. Thirty-two percent (32%) would study the workshop offering more critically. Only about seventeen percent (17%) indicated they would attend fewer workshops if there were no reimbursement. Eight participants (10%) indicated they would not attend a workshop unless reimbursed.

The general trend for all groups appears to be an overwhelming preference for <u>moderate</u> personal active involvement and a preference for being consulted in the planning stage of in-service teacher training.

EVALUATION OF SUMMER WORKSHOP

Content and Presentation

The total group (N = 75) were about evenly split on whether too much content was presupposed. Seventy percent (70%) of the Youngstown group indicated too much content was presupposed. About thirty percent (30%) of the Kent group indicated that too much content was presupposed. The Akron group indicated an even split on the level of content issue.

More than half of the total group (56%) found the content quite a bit relevant to their objectives. An additional twenty seven percent (27%) found the content somewhat relevant to their objectives. The Youngstown group indicated a unanimous (100%) endorsement of some degree of relevance. The Akron group indicated about a ninety percent (90%) endorsement of relevance. The Kent group indicated about a seventy percent (70%) endorsement of relevance.

It is interesting to point out the relationship between content presupposition and relevance. The group (Youngstown) showing the highest percent of content presupposing too much also showed the highest percent of relevance.

All groups indicated approximately the same configurations in their responses concerning preparation of lecturers. The data indicate that the lecturers were well prepared.

The data also reveal that the three groups found the lecturers interesting. Nine from the Youngstown group (65%) indicated that lecturers were quite a bit interesting. Eleven (50%) from the Akron group indicated lecturers were quite a bit interesting. Nine (25%) of the Kent group indicated lecturers were quite a bit interesting. The rank ordering of the three groups on the interest variable parallels the trend on the relevance variable. In other words, the group indicating the highest degree (of the three groups) of relevance also indicated the highest degree for interesting lecturers. The group indicating the lowest degree (again, of the three) on relevance also indicated the lowest degree for interesting lecturers. However, in an absolute sense the conclusion from the data is that all groups found the lecturers interesting.

There was consensus across the three groups that the movies and slides were relevant. About sixty to seventy percent of each group indicated that the movies and slides were quite a bit relevant. An additional fifteen to twenty percent (15-20%) indicated that movies and slides were somewhat relevant.

Environment and Facilities

The Youngstown group expressed satisfaction for both parking and eating facilities. The Akron group was highly satisfied with parking and eating facilities. The Kent group expressed dissatisfaction in both parking and eating facilities. In fact, two out of every three Kent participants responded in a negative way to the question concerning eating facilities.

The participants in the Youngstown group, as a whole, were quite a bit satisfied with their meeting place. The Akron group was somewhat satisfied, and the Kent group was not satisfied with the meeting place.

An interesting anomaly appears in the responses to the question dealing with having a "place to work." The Kent group was not satisfied with its meeting place, but it appeared to have adequate "work places" for participants. On the other hand, the Youngstown group was very satisfied with its meeting room but not particularly satisfied with "work places" for participants. The Akron group was split even and no trend emerges except that half the Akron group felt they had a "place to work" while the other half claimed they had no adequate "place to work."

The Youngstown group and the Akron group reported satisfaction with the availability of resource materials. A little more than a fourth (28%) of the Kent group reported quite a bit of satisfaction and about forty percent (40%) reported no satisfaction with the availability of resource materials.

The groups found handouts to be very useful. Akron and Kent were alike in their responses. At least sixty percent (60%) from each group indicated that handouts were quite a bit useful. An additional twenty-five percent indicated the handouts were somewhat useful. The Youngstown group unequivocally (100%) found the handouts quite a bit helpful.

Scheduling and Organization

Across all groups there appeared to be quite a bit of opportunities for participants to interact with each other. The instructors were alleged to be very accessible. Most responses fell in the quite a bit and somewhat categories. The Kent group had the largest percentage (74%) of quite a bit ratings for accessibility of instructors.

The workshop events appeared to be logically and appropriately sequenced. Again, most responses fell in the quite a bit and somewhat categories. Percentages of responses for the highest rating (quite a bit) were forty, fifty, and sixty (40%, 50%, 60%) respectively for Youngstown, Akron, and Kent.

The Youngstown group indicated (57%--quite a bit and 14%--somewhat) that attempts to evaluate progress interfered with work. The Akron and Kent groups indicated no such interference with a possible but slight exception being that a few participants in the Akron group indicated some interference.

A very interesting and different configuration appears in the responses to item 122. The question deals with having ade-

quate time to pursue self-chosen activities. The Akron group had about half of the participants indicating quite a bit of time but about a fourth indicating having no time. The Kent group responded about evenly across all four categories. The Youngstown group tallied about forty percent in the somewhat category with twenty percent in the no time category and twenty percent in the little time category. Too much within group variability across the three groups prevents the drawing of any conclusions.

The responses from each of the groups indicate a very well organized workshop. About half of the participants tallied somewhat organized and the remaining half tallied quite a bit organized in each of the three groups.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVE COMMENTS

About one-half of the participants chose to comment in their own words on the most valuable and least valuable aspect of the summer program. Few people commented after question 80 and one or two commented in the three other areas on the questionnaire (after questions 117, 118, 124.

Most Valuable Aspect

Four participants indicated the materials and curriculum guides were of utmost value. One participant commended the tremendous instruction. Ten participants noted the importance of the testing information and diagnostic skills learned. One participant applauded the presentation involving the Slosson (SIT), ITPA, and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT). Two participants indicated satisfaction with the amount and depth of interaction among participants. One person commented that he was undecided about the most valuable aspect of the program.

Least Valuable Aspect

Two participants indicated that the questionnaire was the least valuable element in the program. One participant suggested that undergraduates be separated from Focus people. Seven participants particularly disliked the idea of forty-five minutes of teaching by each person. Several people indicated that

there was not enough time spent on teaching techniques. Two participants disapproved of not receiving a bibliography. There was one complaint of a stuffy classroom and one serious objection to the "methods" test. One participant alleged there wasn't an adequate amount spent on detail.

TABLE 1
TEACHER - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

4. Indicate the number of years of teaching experience you have had other than in Special Education.

		T	Y	A	K
1	One year or less	44	43	33	51
2	Two years	8	7	14	5
3	Three years	11	7	24	5
4	Four to ten years	23	21	19	26
5	Ten years or more	14	21	10	13

5. Please indicate your desire to assume some type of administrative or supervisory position in Special Education in the future.

		T	Y	A	K
1	Not interested	19	7	32	15
2	Somewhat interested	33	36	41	28
3	Interested	16	14	14	18
4	Very interested	25	29	14	31

6. Please indicate your marital status

		T	Y	A	K
1	Single	19	21	5	26
2	Married	71	71	82	64
3	Separated	0	0	0	0
4	Divorced	10	7	14	10

7. Please indicate the number of children you have.

		T	Y	A	K
1	No children	43	50	32	46
2	One child	20	14	32	15
3	Two children	15	7	14	18
4	Three to four children	21	29	18	21
5	Five or more children	1	0	4	0

8. Please indicate your age category.

		T	Y	A	K
1	20-30 years	56	50	55	59
2	30-40 years	29	36	36	23
3	40-50 years	12	14	9	13
4	50 years or older	3	0	0	5

TABLE 1
TEACHER - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
CONT.

9. Environmental setting in which you most recently taught:

	T	Y	A	K
1 Inner City	8	7	5	10
2 Other Urban	27	14	32	28
3 Suburban	39	43	36	39
4 Rural	24	36	23	21

10. Prevailing Economic Status or system in which you most recently taught:

	T	Y	A	K
1 Prosperous	13	21	10	13
2 Medium	64	57	82	56
3 Disadvantaged	23	21	9	31

11. Class Level.

	T	Y	A	K
1 Pre-School	3	0	0	5
2 Early Elementary	62	54	59	67
3 Intermediate	24	39	23	21
4 Junior High	7	8	5	8

12. Sex.

	T	Y	A	K
1 Female	92	100	86	92
2 Male	5	0	14	3

13. Highest training level completed.

	T	Y	A	K
1 No degree	3	0	0	5
2 Bachelors	79	79	77	80
3 Masters	19	21	23	16
4 Educational Specialist	0	0	0	0
5 Doctorate	0	0	0	0

TABLE 1
TEACHER - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
Cont.

14. If you are currently enrolled in a training program, circle the number which corresponds to the program in which you are enrolled.

	T	Y	A	K
1 Bachelors	8	7	5	10
2 Masters	37	29	10	54
3 Educational Specialist	11	14	10	10
4 Non-degree program	43	50	75	23
5 Doctorate	1	0	0	3

15. How long have you been teaching in the area of Special Education you are now assigned to?

	T	Y	A	K
1 One year or less	57	71	40	61
2 Two years	13	7	25	8
3 Three years	20	21	15	22
4 Four to ten years	10	0	20	8
5 Ten years or more	0	0	0	0

16. Total Years of Teaching Experience.

	T	Y	A	K
1 One year	25	23	14	32
2 Two years	8	8	9	8
3 Three years	15	23	14	14
4 Four to ten years	33	23	50	27
5 Ten years or more	18	23	14	19

17. Previous experience with in-service education.

	T	Y	A	K
1 Have not attended any workshops	27	14	18	36
2 Have attended one to five workshops	36	43	50	26
3 Have attended five to ten workshops	20	29	27	13
4 Have attended ten to fifteen workshops	8	0	0	15
5 Have attended fifteen or more workshops	9	14	5	10

TABLE 2
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN GENERAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL CATEGORIES*

General

	T	Y	A	K
18. Building productive school, home, and community relationships.	64	71	46	72
19. Developing student interest in classroom activities.	76	64	86	74
20. Developing student interest in activities outside the classroom.	58	64	55	58
21. Managing unacceptable behavior.	89	93	100	82
22. Resolving severe student social emotional problems.	71	79	68	69

Instructional

	T	Y	A	K
23. Physical organization of a classroom.	67	93	64	59
24. Instructional materials and equipment.	76	93	77	69
25. Planning classroom instruction.	78	100	77	71

*Numbers represent the collapsed tally of category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

TABLE 2
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN GENERAL AND
INSTRUCTIONAL CATEGORIES
CONT.

26. Diagnostic assessment techniques.

T	Y	A	K
80	100	86	69

27. Instructional techniques.

T	Y	A	K
80	100	77	74

28. Evaluation of pupil progress.

T	Y	A	K
74	86	73	71

TABLE 3
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN
CONTENT AREAS*

Physical Organization of Classroom

		T	Y	A	K
29.	Language Arts	72	79	91	59
30.	Arithmetic	75	79	73	74
31.	Science, health & safety	43	79	36	33
32.	Social Studies	48	64	50	41
33.	Motor and perceptual training	81	100	91	69
34.	Speech & language training	75	86	86	64
35.	Occupational orientation	39	50	41	33

Instructional Materials and Equipment

		T	Y	A	K
36.	Language Arts	78	79	96	68

*Numbers represent the collapsed tally of category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

TABLE 3
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN
CONTENT AREAS
CONT.

	T	Y	A	K
37. Arithmetic	69	86	77	58
38. Science, health & safety	45	71	36	40
39. Social Studies	55	71	59	48
40. Motor & perceptual training	77	100	91	61
41. Speech & language training	73	100	96	50
42. Occupational orientation	45	57	55	34

Planning for classroom instruction

	T	Y	A	K
43. Language Arts	62	79	77	47
44. Arithmetic	62	79	64	55
45. Science, health & safety	41	79	32	32
46. Social Studies	44	71	38	37

TABLE 3
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN
CONTENT AREAS
CONT.

47. Motor & perceptual training

T	Y	A	K
68	100	77	50

48. Speech & language training

T	Y	A	K
73	100	82	58

49. Occupational orientation

T	Y	A	K
35	50	46	24

Diagnostic and assessment techniques

50. Language arts

T	Y	A	K
74	93	82	63

51. Arithmetic

T	Y	A	K
70	93	73	61

52. Science, health & safety

T	Y	A	K
43	79	32	37

53. Social Studies

T	Y	A	K
53	79	41	50

54. Motor & perceptual training

T	Y	A	K
77	100	91	61

55. Speech and language training

T	Y	A	K
76	93	96	58

TABLE 3
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN
CONTENT AREAS
CONT.

56. Occupational orientation

T	Y	A	K
46	64	45	40

Instructional techniques

57. Language Arts

T	Y	A	K
72	86	86	58

58. Arithmetic

T	Y	A	K
68	93	64	61

59. Science, health & safety

T	Y	A	K
43	79	36	34

60. Social Studies

T	Y	A	K
55	86	50	46

61. Motor & perceptual training

T	Y	A	K
72	100	86	53

62. Speech & Language training

T	Y	A	K
69	93	91	47

63. Occupational orientation

T	Y	A	K
42	50	55	31

TABLE 3
PERCENT EXPRESSING NEEDS IN
CONTENT AREAS
CONT.

Evaluation of student progress: (grading procedures)

		T	Y	A	K
64.	Academic areas	76	85	77	72
65.	Classroom behavior	76	93	73	72
66.	Non-academic subjects	57	64	55	56
67.	Occupational orientation and interest	35	43	36	31
68.	Motor & perceptual development	72	100	82	56

TABLE 4
PERCENT ENDORSING SPECIFIC* METHODS
OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE

Modes

69. Lecture.

T	Y	A	K
19	21	41	5

70. Lecture with demonstration.

T	Y	A	K
73	100	82	58

71. Lecture with reaction panel.

T	Y	A	K
52	64	46	51

72. Panel of experts.

T	Y	A	K
66	79	73	58

73. Professional seminar or round table.

T	Y	A	K
43	50	41	42

74. Rap session with expert.

T	Y	A	K
73	64	91	66

75. Demonstration by expert.

T	Y	A	K
84	93	91	76

76. Consultant works with teacher.

T	Y	A	K
77	86	77	74

77. Regional conference.

T	Y	A	K
41	64	68	34

* Numbers represent the collapsed tally of categoy 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

TABLE 4
PERCENT ENDORSING SPECIFIC* METHODS
OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE
CONT.

78. Work session where technique is given and participants practice.

T	Y	A	K
85	93	86	82

79. Work session with children.

T	Y	A	K
84	79	91	81

Parts of Year Most Convenient

80. Before school starts in Fall.

T	Y	A	K
56	71	50	54

81. At or after beginning of school in Fall

T	Y	A	K
41	64	41	32

82. About mid-semester in Fall

T	Y	A	K
47	64	55	37

83. Before Christmas

T	Y	A	K
12	14	9	13

84. After Christmas break

T	Y	A	K
34	57	27	29

85. At or after beginning of Spring semester

T	Y	A	K
42	57	23	47

86. About mid-semester in Spring

T	Y	A	K
33	69	27	40

* Numbers represent the collapsed tally of category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have.)

TABLE 4
PERCENT ENDORSING SPECIFIC* METHODS
OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE
CONT.

87. Near end of Spring semester

T	Y	A	K
18	21	9	22

88. During Summer vacation

T	Y	A	K
61	57	73	55

Days of Week Most Convenient

89. Monday - Friday after school

T	Y	A	K
39	36	41	40

90. Saturday

T	Y	A	K
58	57	41	68

91. Sunday

T	Y	A	K
12	7	5	16

92. Friday evening - Saturday morning

T	Y	A	K
28	29	27	29

Time of Day Most Convenient

93. Monday - Friday 5 to 9 P.M.

T	Y	A	K
31	29	41	26

* Numbers represent the collapsed tally of category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

TABLE 4
PERCENT ENDORSING SPECIFIC* METHODS
OF PRESENTING IN-SERVICE
CONT.

94. Monday - Friday 6 to 10 P.M.

T	Y	A	K
19	14	18	21

95. Monday - Friday 7 to 10 P.M.

T	Y	A	K
26	14	32	26

96. Saturday 9 a.m. to noon

T	Y	A	K
65	64	59	68

97. Saturday 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

T	Y	A	K
39	43	36	40

98. Weekday 1 to 4 p.m.

T	Y	A	K
57	57	50	61

99. Friday 1 to 9 p.m.

T	Y	A	K
27	21	32	26

100. Friday 7 - 10 p.m. & Saturday 9 a.m. - noon

T	Y	A	K
23	14	23	26

* Numbers represent the collapsed tally of category 1 (strongly desire) and category 2 (would like to have).

TABLE 5
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR CONTENT AND
PRESENTATION RESPONSES

107. Did the content of the lectures and readings presuppose more previous training than you have had?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	19	29	23	13
2	Somewhat	27	43	27	20
3	A little	24	21	27	26
4	No	30	7	23	41

108. To what extent was the content of the lectures and readings relevant to what you hoped to accomplish during the workshop?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	56	64	54	54
2	Somewhat	27	36	36	18
3	A little	9	0	5	15
4	None	7	0	5	10

109. To what extent were the lecturers prepared?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	57	79	68	43
2	Somewhat	31	21	18	41
3	A little	7	0	9	7
4	None	5	0	5	6

110. For the most part were the lecturers stimulating and interesting?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	39	64	50	23
2	Somewhat	44	29	41	51
3	A little	11	7	5	15
4	None	7	0	4	10

111. Were you disappointed in any way with the group of participants?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	11	7	9	15
2	Somewhat	19	21	18	23
3	A little	15	74	5	18
4	None	52	0	65	39

TABLE 5
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR CONTENT AND
PRESENTATION RESPONSES
CONT.

112. Were the movies (slides or videotapes) relevant?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	60	64	72	51
2	Somewhat	20	14	14	26
3	A little	8	7	14	13
4	No	12	14	0	10

* Numbers do not total 100% when respondents do not answer an item.

TABLE 6
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR ENVIRONMENT AND FACILITIES RESPONSES

113. Were you pleased with the eating facilities?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	16	7	35	10
2	Somewhat	20	50	25	8
3	Little	17	21	20	15
4	No	43	21	20	64

114. Were you satisfied with parking arrangements?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	23	21	38	16
2	Somewhat	23	50	24	13
3	Little	21	21	19	24
4	No	29	7	19	45

115. Were you satisfied with your room (meeting place, classroom)?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	16	57	10	5
2	Somewhat	40	36	62	32
3	Little	16	7	19	18
4	No	25	0	9	45

116. Did you feel that you lacked a "place to work?"

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	17	21	14	18
2	Somewhat	31	43	43	20
3	A little	8	36	5	12
4	No	43	0	38	49

117. Were you satisfied with the availability of resource materials (texts,journals,etc.)?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	36	43	46	28
2	Somewhat	27	29	41	18
3	Little	13	7	13	15
4	No	24	21	0	39

TABLE 6
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR ENVIRONMENT AND FACILITIES RESPONSES

118. Were "handouts" useful?

	T	Y	A	K
1 Quite a bit	69	100	64	61
2 Somewhat	20	0	26	23
3 A little	7	0	9	8
4 No	4	0	0	8

* Numbers do not total 100% when respondents do not answer an item.

TABLE 7
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR SCHEDULING
AND ORGANIZATION RESPONSES

119. Did you have sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	76	71	86	74
2	Somewhat	13	29	10	10
3	A little	4	0	4	5
4	No	5	0	0	10

120 Were the instructors accessible so that you could get the individual attention you desired?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	65	50	62	74
2	Somewhat	24	36	33	15
3	A little	4	7	0	5
4	No	5	7	5	5

121. In general, was the workshop organized?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	47	57	38	49
2	Somewhat	40	43	48	36
3	A little	8	0	9	10
4	No	4	0	5	5

122. Did you have enough time to pursue activities of your own choosing?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	28	14	47	23
2	Somewhat	32	43	28	31
3	A little	15	21	0	21
4	No	24	21	24	25

123. Did attempts to evaluate your progress and reactions during the workshop interfere with your work?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	11	57	0	0
2	Somewhat	12	14	29	3
3	A little	11	0	10	15
4	No	65	29	62	80

TABLE 7
TALLIES BY PERCENT FOR SCHEDULING
AND ORGANIZATION RESPONSES
CONT.

124. Were the workshop events logically and appropriately sequenced?

		T	Y	A	K
1	Quite a bit	55	39	52	62
2	Somewhat	33	61	38	20
3	A little	8	0	10	10
4	No	4	0	0	8

* Numbers do not total 100% when respondents do not answer an item.